

REMARKS

Applicants thank the Examiner for the very thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1-8, 10-18, and 21-24 are now present in this application. Claims 1, 2, and 6 are independent. By this amendment, claims 9, 19, and 20 have been canceled, claims 1, 2, 6, 10, and 11 have been amended, and claims 22-24 have been added. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Request for Withdrawal of Finality of Office Action

Applicants respectfully submit that present amendment is being filed concurrently with a Request for Continued Examination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the finality of the previous Office Action, and an Office Action on the merits with respect to claims 1-8, 10-18, and 21-24 are respectfully requested.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner and his Supervisor for the courtesies extended to Applicants' representative during the personal interview, which was conducted on January 20, 2010. An Examiner Interview Summary was made of record as Paper No. 20100120.

During the interview, Applicants' representative proposed changes to the claims to place the claims in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and to overcome the prior art rejections of record. In particular, the Examiner agreed that the amendments to the claims overcame the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Regarding the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner agreed that if he were able to verify that Fig. 6 was a detailed view of the chain 13, as opposed to some other exemplary embodiment of the belt 50, then Applicants arguments regarding the combinations based on Anpo were persuasive. In particular, during the interview, Applicants provided a partial translation of the references describing the relationship of the belt 50, load blocks 14, and chains 13, as follows:

One embodiment of the transmission belt 50 of the present invention is illustrated in Figs. 2 to 5. The transmission belt 50 includes: two (2) chains 13 which comprise a plurality of links 10; and a number of load blocks 14 attached to the chains 13. Each of

the two chains 13 is inserted in a chain-insertion portion situated on each side of the load blocks 14 to form the transmission belt. (See Fig. 5)

and

The transmission belt 50 described above passes around two (2) pulleys 52 and 54 when used, as shown in Fig. 11. The pulleys 52 and 54 comprise fixed conical members 52a and 54a, respectively, and movable conical members 52b and 54b, respectively; thereby forming opposed conical surfaces 32 and 34, and 32' and 34'. Tapered surfaces 14a are provided at both sides of the load blocks 14 so as to be in contact with the conical surfaces 32, 34, 32' and 34' of the pulleys.

Therefore, it is the load blocks 14 that provide the transmission of force and not the pins 12 of the individual chains. For at least this reason, Applicants' representative submitted that one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to modify Van Rooij to provide pins having different shapes as disclosed by Anpo.

Furthermore, Anpo discloses that outside link plates 10b are provided such that any of the three kinds of joint pins can be press-fitted. As such, Applicants' representative argued that the focus of Anpo is not on the particular shapes or rigidities of the joint pins and how they affect the power transmission. As such, one of ordinary skill in the art would not look to modify Van Rooij to provide the pins as set forth in independent claims 1, 2, and 6 based on the teachings of Anpo.

The claims have been amended in the manner discussed during the interview, and are believed to place the application into condition for allowance. Accordingly, reconsideration and allowance of the present application are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph

Claims 6-10 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 1st Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner states that the claims appear to require that either the first or second pins are the friction contact member or that there is a 3rd pin that is not disclosed in the specification and is not shown in the drawings.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 6 to rename the second pins as strips, which is supported in the specification and drawings, and to define the first pins as corresponding to the claimed friction transmission members, which is supported and shown in the drawings.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, are enabled and fully supported by and adequately described in the written description of the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph

Claims 6-11 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd Paragraph. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner has set forth certain instances wherein the claim language is not clearly understood.

In order to overcome this rejection, Applicants have amended claim 6 as discussed during the interview to correct each of the deficiencies specifically pointed out by the Examiner regarding the pins. In addition, claim 11 has been amended to make clear that the claimed power transmission chain is the chain defined in claim 1.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims, as amended, particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as the invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103

Claims 1-5, 11-17, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Greiter; claims 1-3, 5, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Anpo; claims 6-10 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Greiter in view of Van Rooij; claims 4, 13, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anpo in view of Zimmer; claims 6-9 and 18-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anpo in view of Van Rooij; claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Anpo in view of Van Rooij and

further in view of Zimmer; claims 1-3, 5-9, 11, 12, 15, 16, and 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Rooij in view of Anpo; and claims 4, 10, 13, 14, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Rooij in view of Anpo and further in view of Zimmer. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Complete discussions of the Examiner's rejections are set forth in the Office Action, and are not being repeated here.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 9, 19, and 20 have been cancelled, thus rendering portions of these rejections moot. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of these portions of the rejections are respectfully requested.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claims 1, 2, and 6 have been amended as discussed during the personal interview with the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that combinations of elements as set forth in independent claims 1, 2, and 6 are not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including Greiter, Van Rooij, and Anpo, as discussed more fully during the personal interview. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

With regard to dependent claims 3-5, 7, 8, 10-18, and 21, Applicants submit that these claims depend, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1, 2, or 6, which are allowable for the reasons set forth above, and therefore these claims are allowable based on their dependence from claim 1, 2, or 6, as well as for their additionally recited subject matter. Reconsideration and allowance thereof are respectfully requested.

Claims 22-24

Claims 22-24 have been added for the Examiner's consideration. Applicants submit that claims 22-24 depend from independent claims 1, 2, and 6, respectively, and are therefore allowable based on their dependence from claim 1, 2, or 6, which are believed to be allowable.

In addition, claims 22-24 recite further limitations which are not disclosed or made obvious by the applied prior art references.

Consideration and allowance of claims 22-24 are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone Chad D. Wells, Registration No. 50,875, at (703) 205-8000, in the Washington, D.C. area.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Dated: January 21, 2010

Respectfully submitted

By 

Paul C. Lewis

Registration No.: 43,368

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

8110 Gatehouse Road

Suite 100 East

P.O. Box 747

Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000

Attorney for Applicants